



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/729,771

12/08/2003

Erik de Groot

120 04992US

3404

128 7590 01/04/2008
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.
101 COLUMBIA ROAD
P O BOX 2245
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245

EXAMINER

DAO, THUY CHAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2192

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/04/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/729,771

Applicant(s)

DE GROOT ET AL.

Examiner

Thuy Dao

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 and 29-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 and 29-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on October 26, 2007.
2. Claims 1-27 and 29-37 have been examined.

Response to Amendments

3. Per Applicants' request, claims 1, 11-13, 15-16, 18, 21, 24, 26, and 29-32 have been amended and claim 28 has been canceled.
4. The objection to the specification is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendments.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicants' arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-27, 29-34, and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dardinski (art of record, US Patent No. 6,754,885) in view of Van Huben (art of record, US Patent No. 6,654,747).

Claim 1:

Dardinski discloses *a method for enforcing a life cycle process in a source control system, comprising:*

receiving a life cycle process having a plurality of states (e.g., FIG. 45, col.52: 6-60; col.54: 58-64; col.58: 16-23);

providing a change state function for a user to change a current one of said states associated with an object to a next one of said states associated with said object (e.g., col.53: 40-52; col.54: 58-64; col.107: 7-18; col.63: 2-23);

providing version control for said object in said source control system (e.g., col.51: 59 – col.52: 14; col.55: 14-63).

Dardinski does not explicitly disclose other limitations. However, in an analogous art, Van Huben further discloses:

receiving a user-defined life cycle process having a plurality of states, each state having attributes; receiving user-defined state transitions between said plurality of states (e.g., FIG. 5A-B, col.15: 63 – col.16: 14);

providing a change state function for a user to change a current one of said states associated with an object to a next one of said states associated with said object (e.g., col.16: 15-24),

said change state function verifying compliance with said user-defined state transitions (e.g., col.16: 25-41).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Van Huben's teaching into Dardinski's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to permits alternative techniques for implementing complex application algorithms, simplify customization, and provide code maintenance and deployment as suggested by Van Huben (e.g., col.15: 63 - col.16: 41).

Claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said version control comprises: providing a check-in function; and providing a check-out function (e.g. col.53: 53 – col.54: 38).*

Claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Van Huben further discloses *said attributes include a fallback state (e.g., FIG. 5A-B, col.15: 63 – col.16: 24).*

Art Unit: 2192

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Van Huben's teaching into Dardinski's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 1 above.

Claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *receiving user-defined security for said user-defined state transitions* (e.g., col.64: 12-53).

Claim 6:

The rejection of claim 4 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said user-defined security includes which users have permission to make which state transitions* (e.g., col.64: 46 – col.65: 16).

Claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said object is a control strategy for a process control system* (e.g., FIG. 1, col.8: 23 – col.9: 20).

Claim 8:

The rejection of claim 7 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said attributes include whether said control strategy is loadable to a controller* (e.g., FIG. 2, col.9: 21-51).

Claim 9:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Van Huben further discloses *receiving said user-defined life cycle process having said plurality of states, each state having attributes is performed through a user interface having an editable table, said table having state names as rows and attributes as columns and having cells indicating values for said attributes* (e.g., col.16: 25-41).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Van Huben's teaching into Dardinski's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

Claim 10:

The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated. Van Huben further discloses *receiving user- defined state transitions between said plurality of states is performed through a user interface having an editable table, said table having state names as rows and column and having cells indicating which users have permission to make which state transitions* (e.g., FIG. 5A-B and related text).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Van Huben's teaching into Dardinski's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

Claim 11:

Dardinski discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method in a life cycle process of determining permissions for actions with an object based on a state of said object, said life cycle process comprises a plurality of states that each have a state definition and a plurality of state transitions between the plurality of states* (e.g., FIG. 45, col.52: 6 – col.55: 64), *said method comprising:*

receiving a request to perform an action with said object (e.g., FIG. 45, col.52: 6-60; col.54: 58-64; col.58: 16-23);

determining whether said object has ever been checked-in to a source control system (e.g., col.54: 10-38; FIG. 8);

determining whether said object is currently checked-in (e.g., col.56: 60 – col.57: 4; col.53: 32 – col.54: 38);

providing a permission status to perform, or not perform said action with said object (e.g., col.64: 46 – col.65: 16).

Dardinski does not explicitly disclose other limitations. However, Van Huben further discloses:

said life cycle process comprises a plurality of user defined states that each have a state definition and a plurality of user defined state transitions between the plurality of states (e.g., col.15: 63 – col.16: 41);

retrieving from said plurality of definitions, a definition of said user defined state of said object; determining from said definition whether said action is permissible in said state (e.g., col.15: 63 – col.16: 14); and

providing a permission status to perform or not perform said action with said object (e.g., FIG. 5A-B and related text).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Van Huben's teaching into Dardinski's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 1 above.

Claim 12:

Dardinski discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of validating state transitions between states, said method comprising:*

determining whether said object is checked-in (e.g., col.53: 53 – col.54: 9; FIG. 8);

permitting said state transition, if said user has permission (e.g., col.64: 12-53); and

providing a state transition status (e.g., col.64: 46 – col.65: 16).

Dardinski does not explicitly disclose other limitations. However, Van Huben further discloses:

validating user defined state transitions between user defined states (e.g., FIG. 5A-B and related text),

making a user defined state transition from one of said user defined states to a next one of said user defined states (e.g., col.16: 15-41);

Art Unit: 2192

a user-defined state transition model that comprises restrictions and permissions for said user defined state transitions (e.g., col.15: 63 – col.16: 14).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Van Huben's teaching into Dardinski's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 1 above.

Claim 13:

Dardinski discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of validating a state transition from a current state to a next state of a plurality of states, said method comprising:*

determining whether said next state in a state transition request from a user is allowed from said current state in said state transition request based on transition restrictions (e.g. col.64: 12-53);

determining whether said user has permission to make said state transition based on said transition restrictions (e.g., col.64: 46 – col.65: 16); and

providing a state transition status (e.g., col.52: 6-60; col.64: 46 – col.65: 16).

Dardinski does not explicitly disclose other limitations. However, Van Huben further discloses:

validating a user defined state transition from a current state to a next state of a plurality of user defined states (e.g., col.15: 63 – col.16: 14),

said user defined state transition request based on user-defined transition restrictions and providing a state transition status (e.g., col.16: 15-41).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Van Huben's teaching into Dardinski's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 1 above.

Claim 14:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *determining whether said state transition has a restricted signing requirement and, if so, verifying that said restricted signing requirement is met* (e.g., col.64: 12-45; col.65: 45-62).

Claim 16:

Dardinski discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of determining a new state for an object version upon check-in, said method comprising:*

determining whether said object is being checked-in for a first time (e.g., FIG. 8, col.14: 38-65; FIG. 45, col.52: 6 – col.55; 64);

a first pre-defined state, if said object is being checked-in for said first time (e.g., col.21: 21-41; col.54: 10-38),

wherein a second state is a life cycle stage of said qualification process (e.g., col.61: 24 – col.62: 37); *and*

providing said second state, if said object is being checked-in for said first time (e.g., col.54: 5-21 and 58-64).

Dardinski does not explicitly disclose other limitations. However, in an analogous art, Van Huben further discloses:

a user defined qualifications process comprising a plurality of user defined states (e.g., col.15: 63 – col.16: 41);

retrieving a first fallback state from said plurality of user defined states for a first pre-defined state, if said object is being checked-in for said first time (e.g., col.16: 15-41);

providing said first fallback state, if said object is being checked-in for said first time (e.g., col.15: 63 – col.16: 24).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Van Huben's teaching into Dardinski's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 1 above.

Claim 17:

Art Unit: 2192

The rejection of claim 16 is incorporated. Van Huben further discloses *retrieving a current state for a current version of said object, if said object is not being checked-in for said first time; retrieving a current fallback state for said current state of said object, if said object is not being checked-in for said first time; and providing said current fallback state, if said object is not being checked-in for said first time* (e.g., col.16: 1-41).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Van Huben's teaching into Dardinski's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

Claim 18:

Dardinski discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of processing an addition of a new state to a life cycle qualification process comprising a plurality of states* (e.g., FIG. 45, col.52: 6 – col.55; 64), *said method comprising:*

receiving a definition of said new state from a user (e.g., col.14: 38-65; col.21: 21-41; col.7: 12-29),

a second state, wherein said second state is a life cycle stage of said qualification process (e.g., col.54: 5-21; col.54: 58-64; col.61: 24 – col.62: 37).

Dardinski does not explicitly disclose other limitations. However, Van Huben further discloses:

a new state to a life cycle qualification process comprising a plurality of user defined states, a definition of said new state including a name and a fallback state, wherein said fallback state is a life cycle stage of said qualification process (e.g., FIG. 5A-B and related text);

determining whether said name is unique among existing state definitions of said plurality of user defined states; validating said fallback state (e.g., col.15: 63 – col.16; 41); and

adding said definition to a source control system, only if said name is unique and said fallback state is valid (e.g., col.16: 15-41).

Art Unit: 2192

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Van Huben's teaching into Dardinski's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to permit alternative techniques (i.e., state tables with state names, promotion states, and fallback states) for implementing complex application algorithm as suggested by Van Huben (e.g., col.15: 63 – col.16: 12).

Claim 19:

The rejection of claim 18 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said definition includes a restricted signing requirement and further comprising: validating said restricted signing requirement; and wherein said adding said definition to said source control system is performed on an additional condition of whether said restricted signing requirement is valid* (e.g., FIG. 58, 56, 61 and related text).

Claim 20:

The rejection of claim 18 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *determining whether said user has a privilege to edit said definition; and wherein said adding said definition to said source control system is performed on an additional condition of whether said user has said privilege* (e.g., security, section 1.10; permission, section 1.10.1.4).

Claim 21:

Dardinski discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of processing a modification of a state of a plurality of states of a qualification process, said method comprising:*

receiving a modified definition of said user state from a user, wherein said state is a life cycle stage of said qualification process (e.g., col.52: 6-60; col.53: 32 – col.54: 64; col.58: 16-23).

Dardinski does not explicitly disclose other limitations. However, Van Huben further discloses:

a modification of a state of a plurality of user defined states of a user defined qualification process, said modified definition of said user defined state including a name and a fallback state, wherein said fallback state is a life cycle stage of said qualification process (e.g., col.15: 63 – col.16: 41);

determining whether said name is unique among existing user defined state definitions; validating said fallback state; and updating said modified definition in a source control system, only if said name is unique and said fallback state is valid (e.g., FIG. 5A-B and related text).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Van Huben's teaching into Dardinski's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claims 16 and 18 above.

Claim 22:

The rejection of claim 21 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said definition includes a restricted signing requirement and further comprising: validating said restricted signing requirement; and wherein said updating said modified definition in said source control system is performed on an additional condition of whether said restricted signing requirement is valid (e.g., security, section 1.10; permission, section 1.10.1.4).*

Claim 23:

The rejection of claim 21 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *determining whether said user has a privilege to edit said definition; and wherein said updating said modified definition in said source control system is performed on an additional condition of whether said user has said privilege (e.g., FIG. 56 and related text).*

Claim 24:

Dardinski also discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of processing the deletion of a state of*

a plurality of states in a life cycle process of a source control system, said method comprising:

a state definition (e.g., FIG. 45, col.52: 6-60; col.53: 32 – col.54: 64);

objects in said source control system have a current state equal to said state (e.g., FIG. 1; col.8: 23 – col.9: 20; FIG. 2, col.9: 21-51).

Dardinski does not explicitly disclose:

the deletion of a state of a plurality of user defined states in a life cycle process; receiving a request to delete a state definition for said state from a user; determining whether said state definition is referenced by any other state definition in said source control system (e.g., col.16: 15-41);

determining whether any objects in said source control system have a current state equal to said state (e.g., FIG. 5A-B and related text);

deleting said state definition from said source control system, only if said state definition is not referenced by any other state definition in said source control system and no objects in said source control system have said current state equal to said state (e.g., col.15: 63 – col.16: 24).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Van Huben's teaching into Dardinski's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claims 16 and 18 above.

Claim 25:

The rejection of claim 24 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *determining whether said user has a privilege to delete said definition; and wherein said deleting said state definition from said source control system is performed on an additional condition of whether said user has said privilege (e.g., security, section 1.10; permission, section 1.10.1.4).*

Claim 26:

Dardinski discloses *a source control system for a process control system, comprising:*

a processor (e.g., FIG. 1, col.8: 23 – col.9: 20);

a life cycle process component executable on said processor to enforce compliance with life cycle states of objects of a control strategy of a plurality of devices of said process control system (e.g., col.52: 6-60; col.54: 58-64; col.58: 16-23);

a version control component executable on said processor to associate a one or more version numbers with said objects (e.g., col.51: 59 – col.52: 14; col.55: 14-63);

a state configuration component executable on said processor; and a controller in communication with said processor via network to be loaded with said objects to provide process control of said plurality of devices according to said control strategy (e.g., FIG. 45, col.52: 6 – col.55: 64).

Dardinski does not explicitly disclose other limitations. However, Van Huben further discloses:

user-defined life cycle states of objects of a control strategy of a plurality of devices of said process control system (e.g., col.16: 15-24);

a state configuration component executable on said processor to receive state information from a user for each state (e.g., col.15: 63 – col.16: 14); and

a controller in communication with said processor via a network to be loaded with said objects to provide process control of said plurality of devices according to said control strategy (e.g., col.16: 25-41).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Van Huben's teaching into Dardinski's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 1 above.

Claim 27:

The rejection of claim 26 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *another processor to back-up said processor (e.g., col.8: 23 – col.9: 20).*

Claim 29:

Art Unit: 2192

The rejection of claim 26 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said state information includes a state name and an indication of whether load to controller is allowed from that state* (e.g., col. 61: 24 – col.62: 18).

Claim 30:

The rejection of claim 26 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said state information includes a fallback state* (e.g., col.61: 24 – col.62: 37; col.54: 5-21).

Claim 31:

The rejection of claim 26 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said state information includes an indication of whether restricted signing is needed* (e.g., col.64: 12-45; col.65: 45-62).

Claim 32:

The rejection of claim 26 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said state configuration component provides editing functions for said state information* (e.g., col.108: 5-15).

Claim 33:

The rejection of claim 26 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *a state transition component executable on said processor to receive state transition configuration requirements from a user* (e.g., col.51: 59 – col.52: 14; col.55: 14-63).

Claim 34:

The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said state transition configuration requirements include which users have permission to make particular state transitions* (e.g., col.64: 12-45; col.61: 24 – col.62: 18).

Claim 36:

The rejection of claim 26 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said version control component provides check-in and check-out functions* (e.g., col.53: 53 – col.54: 38).

Claim 37:

The rejection of claim 26 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *a change qualification state component to process a qualification state transition request from a user* (e.g., col.64: 12-53).

8. Claims 5, 15, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dardinski in view of Van Huben, and further in view of Murthy (art of record, US Patent No. 7,000,118).

Claim 5:

The rejection of claim 4 is incorporated. Dardinski discloses permission (FIG. 61, section 1.10.1.4 and 1.10.2), security (FIG. 58, section 1.10), and audit trail (FIG. 56, section 1.8.4.7), but does not explicitly disclose *electronic signatures*.

However, in an analogous art, Murthy further discloses *electronic signatures* (e.g., col.1: 48 – col.2: 4).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Murthy's teaching into Dardinski and Van Huben's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to validate the audit trail as suggested by Murthy (e.g., col.1: 48-67).

Claim 15:

Dardinski discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of validating a state transition of a life cycle process in a source control system, said method comprising:*

determining whether a current state transition in a state transition request for an object from a user requires a permission (e.g., col.52: 6-60; col.53: 32 – col.54: 64; col.58: 16-23); FIG. 61, section 1.10);

allowing said current state transition only if said user has the permission (e.g., FIG. 56, 58 and related text).

Dardinski does not disclose other limitations. However, in an analogous art, Van Huben further discloses:

a user defined state transition of a life cycle process in a source control system, determining whether a current user defined state transition in a state transition request for an object from a user based on user-defined transition restrictions of said life cycle process (e.g., FIG. 5A-B and related text);

determining whether a previous user defined state transition for said object, allowing said current user defined state transition; and providing a validation status (e.g., col.15: 63 – col.16: 41).

Neither Dardinski nor Van Huben explicitly discloses the remaining limitations. However, in an analogous art, Murthy further discloses *determining whether a current state transition in a state transition request for an object from a user requires an electronic signature; determining whether a previous state transition for said object required a previous electronic signature, if said current state transition requires a current electronic signature; allowing said current state transition only if said previous electronic signature is different than said current electronic signature (e.g., col.2: 1-21; col.2: 63 – col.3: 2).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Murthy' s teaching into Dardinski and Van Huben' s teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to support the four-eye principle in a secure database system as suggested by Murthy (e.g., col.2: 5-21).

Claim 35:

The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated. Murthy further discloses said state transition configuration requirements include an indication of whether an electronic signature is needed to make particular state transitions (e.g., col.2: 63 – col.3: 2).

Conclusion

9. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Thuy Dao (Twee), whose telephone is (571) 272 8570. The examiner can normally be reached on every Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 6:00AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached at (571) 272 3695.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 2192

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

T. Dao

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'TUAN DAM', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the left.

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER